



English Language Arts Standards Review & Development Meeting

Date: February 20, 2018

Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Location: Holiday Inn Express

1000 Vandalay Drive Frankfort, KY

Meeting Purpose:	Revise, review, and develop Kentucky Academic Standards in accordance with SB1 (2017)
Meeting Called by:	Jamee Barton
Members:	Eric Neely, Dr. Amy Seely Flint, Rebecca King, Kristin Morgan, Jordon Floyd, Annette Williams Dr. Peggy Otto, Pam Johnson, Dr. Michael DiCissco, Brittany Hargrove KDE Staff: Jamee Barton, Micki Ray, Jackie Rogers, and Kyle Lee

Time	Agenda Items	Lead	Discussion
8:30	Meeting Called to Order/Roll Call	Kyle Lee	Present: Eric Neely, Dr. Amy Flint, Rebecca King, Kristin Morgan, Annette Williams, Jordon Floyd, Dr. Michael DiCissco, Dr. Peggy Otto, Pam Johnson Absent: Brittany Hargrove
8:33	Approval of Agenda	Kyle Lee	Motion: Eric Neely Second: Rebecca King
8:35	Clarification of Justifications	Kyle Lee	Dr. Lee reminded the group that changes are important, but the reasons for the changes are more important. All changes must be researched based.
8:45	Welcome Back/Pulse Check	Jackie Rogers	All committee members are feeling good about the work that occurred yesterday and there were no issues to discuss at this time.
9:00	Continue looking at Standard	Micki Ray	The two teams from the day before continued their work of reviewing the standards revisions and suggestions from the Advisory Panel (AP) group.
11:30	Lunch	All members	
12:30	Continue looking at Standards	Micki Ray	Groups continue the standards work
2:00	Progress Check	Micki Ray	Groups are not finished, continue the work
3:00	Progress Check	Micki Ray	Language/Writing group complete Literature/Informational group still working Language group begins working on "Writers' Vision" for the standards. Dr. Flint begins reading over Fluency work from the APs Literature/Informational group continues standards work
3:45	Wrapping Up/Next Steps	Jamee Barton	Group makes a list of next steps – thoughts are captured on post-its to review before the next AP meeting Jamee helps group complete travel paperwork and sub reimbursement forms
4:00	Final Thoughts	Micki Ray	Group responds to feedback questions Answers are collected
4:15	Conclusion of the Meeting	Jamee Barton	Motion to Adjourn: Peggy Otto Second: Kristin Morgan Unanimous Vote to Adjourn



English Language Arts Standards Review & Development Committee Meeting

Date: February 19, 2018

Time: 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Location: Holiday Inn Express

1000 Vandalay Drive Frankfort, KY

Meeting Purpose:	Revise, review, and develop Kentucky Academic Standards in accordance with SB1 (2017)
Meeting Called by:	Jamee Barton
Members:	Eric Neely, Dr. Amy Seely Flint, Rebecca King, Kristin Morgan, Jordon Floyd, Annette Williams Dr. Peggy Otto, Pam Johnson, Dr. Michael DiCissco, Brittany Hargrove KDE Staff: Jamee Barton, Micki Ray, Whitney Hamilton, Chris Crouch, Jackie Rogers

Time	Agenda Items	Lead	Discussion
10:05	Meeting called to order	Jamee Barton	
10:06	Roll Call	Jamee Barton	Present: Eric Neely, Dr. Amy Flint, Rebecca King, Kristin Morgan, Annette Williams, Jordon Floyd, Dr. Michael DiCissco, Dr. Peggy Otto, Pam Johnson Absent: Brittany Hargrove
10:08	Approval of Agenda	Jamee	Motion: Michael DiCissco Second: Eric Neely
10:10	Introductions from KDE staff	KDE staff	
10:13	Welcome and Overview of the work	Jamee Barton	Set norms for the meeting. Gave 4 norms for the group and gave context on why that is important. Jamee gave an overview of the standards review process, SB1 requirements for standards G revision. Gave an “at-a-glance” review of the upcoming schedule. Clarified that computer science is not on the list. Question arose about why science standards were not on the list. Jamee explained that they are not up for review at this time, but will be in the future. Explained that through the timeline we “hope” to have standards ready by August 2018. Showed the flow chart of steps that will be taken and have been taken in standards review.
10:23	Stop, Think, and Share	Jackie Rogers	To support teaching and learning, revised standards should... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jot thought 2. Partner Share 3. Whole group Whole group responses charted and posted: Need real-life connections for students; Need to respect diverse ways of thinking and understanding; Need to be current, relevant, and easily understood; Need balance between local needs and national alignment; Need to be in a clear progression; Need to be guides, not scripts.
10:35	Review of Advisory Panel Work	Whitney Hamilton and Micki Ray	Gave a review of the work the Advisory Panel had done. Discussion about what high quality standards should do. Presentation of various frameworks: gave sample architectures, discussed components of the architectures

			and the reaction of the Advisory Panel (AP) to each. Gave the eventual “Must Haves” the AP decided. “Have we looked at architectures from other states?” Facilitators indicated that the first architectures were from other states and those were used for APs as well. A member suggested that the icons should indicate what they do. Group member commented that she didn’t understand all the color coding and how it worked. Facilitators reiterated that this would be a part of the RDC as development.
11:05	Review of Architecture work	Chris Crouch	<p>Discussion to lead into work around architectures. What about the architecture presented by the AP group. What works well? What may be missing or may be confusing? Are there any gaps in effectively communicating the standards? Their work began by looking at architecture and through the lens of these questions. Review and Development Committee member asked how the dynamic piece of the standards’ architecture would be represented on the website. The RDC was encouraged to build as if there were no restrictions. Others noted they wanted it to be easily printed. They were asked to think about both the static and dynamic version. “How much attention are we actually paying to the design?” The group worked on analyzing, making suggestions, asking questions about the architectures they were given.</p> <p>The RDC came back together as a full group and discussed what they had been working on, and engaged in an open conversation about what they liked, didn’t like, what seemed to work well, not work well and gaps.</p>
12:00	Lunch		
1:00	Further Discussion of Architecture Work	Whitney Hamilton and Chris Crouch	Began discussion about the work and thinking prior to lunch. A participant gathered what the group had been saying and made a rough draft of their thinking. The RDC began drafting the refinement & recommendations section. Refinement: arrangement of anchor standards, overview for each grade level, glossary and text complexity. Recommendations: choose a refinement group and develop a solution. The group as a whole decided to divide and conquer items. They split into two groups to work for thirty minutes before coming back as a whole group. They chose coding icons and headings and multi-dimensionality.
1:45	Further Discussion of Architecture Work	Whitney Hamilton	Groups shared their thinking and ideas with each other. Discussed the RDC drafting an overview for the Advisory Panel to understand the RDC’s thinking.
2:15	Begin Looking at Standards	Micki Ray	Standards. Created breakout groups according to Reading Literature & Informational, Writing & Language, Foundational Skills & Cursive. Each group had a

			representative from elementary, middle, high, community/university. Groups used template in shared Google Team Drive to document their thinking.
3:50	Feedback and Reflection about the day	Whitney Hamilton	Feedback on Process. How are you feeling about the work accomplished today? What questions do you have? Is there anything we can do to improve the process tomorrow? Participants wrote responses on sticky notes and commented aloud.
4:02	Meeting Concluded	Jamee Barton	Motion to adjourn: Annette Williams Motion Second: Michael DiCisso Unanimous vote to conclude